

THE REMONSTRANCE

AGAINST WOMAN SUFFRAGE

BOSTON, JANUARY, 1919

The Remonstrance is published quarterly by the Women's Anti-Suffrage Association of Massachusetts. It expresses the views of women in Massachusetts, Maine, Rhode Island, New York, Nebraska, Iowa, Pennsylvania, Michigan, Connecticut, Maryland, New Hampshire, Vermont, New Jersey, South Dakota, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Ohio, Virginia and other states.

Any one who desires to receive the quarterly numbers for one year can do so by enclosing 25 cents in stamps to the Treasurer,

MRS. JAMES M. CODMAN,
Walnut St., Brookline.

Information in regard to The Remonstrance and other Publications of the Association may be obtained from the Secretary, Room 615, Kensington Building, Boston.

Women's Anti-Suffrage Association of
Massachusetts

One hundred and fifty-eight Branch Committees; 41,300*
members in 443 cities, towns, and villages

MRS. THOMAS ALLEN, PRESIDENT
MRS. JOHN BALCH, VICE-PRESIDENT
MRS. GEORGE R. AGASSIZ
MRS. ROBERT S. BRADLEY
MISS ANNA L. DAWES
MRS. LOUIS A. FROTHINGHAM
MRS. CHARLES E. GUILD
MRS. CURTIS GUILD
MRS. FRANCIS C. LOWELL
MRS. ROBERT S. RUSSELL
MRS. HENRY M. WHITNEY
MRS. JAMES M. CODMAN, Treasurer
Walnut Street, Brookline

Honorary
Vice-
Presidents

Education and Organization Committee
Chairman

MISS M. LOUISE BROWN

Membership Committee
Chairman

MISS JULIA C. PRENDERGAST

Publicity Committee
Chairman

MRS. HENRY PRESTON WHITE

Public Interest League
President

MRS. B. L. ROBINSON

College Anti-Suffrage League
President

MRS. HERBERT LYMAN

Recording Secretary
MRS. FRANK FOXCROFT

Corresponding Secretary
MRS. A. H. PARKER

State Organizer
MISS ALICE D. W. WHITE

* Not present membership of women over 21 years of age; eliminating those names which the Association has lost from deaths, resignations, and removals from the State

MEMBERS ARE EARNESTLY REQUESTED TO KEEP HEADQUARTERS ADVISED OF CHANGES OF ADDRESS.

THREE STEPS TOWARD CHAOS

There are three steps toward political chaos which it is possible for the United States to take after the war. They are successive steps, the first leading to the second, and the second to the third.

The first is the nation-wide adoption of woman suffrage. This would immensely enlarge the inexperienced, uninformed and easily manipulated electorate. It would add to the cohorts of the Hinky Dinks and the Bathhouse Johns. It would bring to the front as national leaders women of the type of those who have been making raids upon the Capitol at Washington and have tried to force their way into the Senate Chamber, where they planned to burn the speeches of anti-suffrage Senators. It would elect Jeannette Rankins to both House and Senate.

The next step is the extension of Socialism, and an enormous reinforcement of the Socialist strength. The alliance between suffragism and Socialism is now an established fact. Every Socialist is a suffragist, and the figures show that, in the New York election of November, 1917, it was the increased Socialist vote in New York City which overcame the anti-suffrage majority in the rest of the State, and gave the State to the suffragists. By no means all Americans realise what it is that Socialism in this country stands for. The latest authoritative definition of it is found in the pre-election pledge of Franklin P. Brill, Socialist candidate for Congress last November from the Forty-first New York district. He said:

"If you elect me to Congress, I shall urge the workers to take possession of the banks, mills, mines, factories, railroads and all the means and instruments of production.

"I shall advocate the abolition of the United States Senate and the United States Supreme Court, and I shall also advocate the abolition of the veto power of the President.

"I shall advocate working-class control and reorganization of the educational system."

These planks in the Socialist platform as defined by Mr. Brill—especially the first—show how slight is the difference between American Socialism and Russian Bolshevism. Mr. Brill and his associates are first cousins to the Bolsheviks who, at Petrograd and elsewhere, have been seizing the banks, looting property, and executing summarily and without trial thousands of the bourgeoisie and intellectual class. The third step, from the Brill type of Socialism to the level of Russian Bolshevism, would be a short one. Despatches from Petrograd report that, in the arrests and executions there, women leaders have been even more merciless than the men. As for the code of morals and social order for which the Russian Bolsheviks stand, the official gazette of the Vladimir soviet of workers and soldiers' deputies furnishes significant evidence. The soviets at Luga, Kolpin, Khivlensk and other places have decreed that Russian maidens, when they reach the age of eighteen, become "the property of the State." They are compelled to register at a Government "bureau of free love." A woman thus registered has "the right to choose from among men between 19 and 50 a cohabitant husband." The consent of the men chosen is not necessary, the decree adds, the man chosen having no right to protest. A similar privilege of choosing from among the registered women is given every man between 19 and 50 "without the consent of the women." This provision is described as "in the interest of the state"; and children born of

THE REMONSTRANCE.

such marriages are to become "the property of the state."

If, among the readers of **THE REMONSTRANCE**, there are any men or women who have come to feel that woman suffrage is a minor issue, and that its significance and consequences have been exaggerated, let them reflect a little upon the three steps toward political and moral chaos which are possible for the United States, and upon the close connection between them.

THE REMONSTRANCE asks all such persons to consider whether it is not the part of wisdom to oppose, strongly and unintermittently, the first step, lest, when it is too late, we find ourselves as a nation moving toward the second and third. For individuals and for nations, the time to consider the consequences of going over a precipice is before, not after.

THE HOUNDING OF SENATOR BAIRD

One of the most illuminating incidents of the November elections was the suffragist hounding of Senator Baird of New Jersey.

The process may be said to have begun some weeks before the taking of the vote in the Senate on the 1st of October. President Wilson sent to Senator Baird a personal letter, appealing to him to vote for the Federal suffrage amendment on the ground that its adoption was "vital to the winning of the great struggle for the supremacy of democracy throughout the world." Senator Baird replied courteously that he could not agree with the President's view of the pressing importance of the issue, and he asked:

"Would it not be better to leave the settlement of this extraneous question to calm and clear minds when the war is over? May it not be disposed of with better judgment than now when we are engrossed in the tremendous task of raising millions of men and borrowing billions of dollars to finance the greatest conflict of all times?"

There was not a word in Senator Baird's letter to give offence—unless it be an offence to differ with the President on any point. When the suffrage resolution came up in the Senate, he followed his convictions and voted against it, for the reason which he had frankly communicated to the President.

As soon as the campaign in New Jersey opened, the suffragist hounding of Senator Baird began. Suffrage orators charged that he had "repudiated his pledge" and "did not stand by the President, as he had promised" when the fact was that he had given no pledge, and had told the President that he could not stand by him on this issue. The suffragists gathered speakers and organizers from half a dozen States, made a personal canvass of the voters, and made a whirlwind tour of the State in automobiles carrying banners inscribed:

Beat Baird.

He Defeated Suffrage in the Senate.
He Refused His Support When the President Asked For It.

President Wilson took a hand in the campaign with a letter urging the election of the opposing candidate; saying that Mr. Baird had certainly not represented "the true feeling and spirit of the people of New Jersey"; and declaring that "It would be a very great make-weight thrown into the international scale if his course of action while in the Senate be reversed by the people of our great State." In reply, Senator Baird said:

"I have backed up the President in everything that he needed to win the war, but could not agree with his view that the Woman Suffrage amendment was a war measure. There were twenty-three Senators of his own party who also looked at it as a political and not a war measure, and opposed it.

I do not change my convictions over night. I am quite willing that the voters shall decide on my record as a citizen and as United States Senator."

Orators from both of the national suffrage organizations made appeals and distributed literature in the army

training camps; and they finished their spectacular campaign against Senator Baird with a twenty-four hour open-air meeting at Newark, ending at six o'clock on the morning of the election.

But the strenuous "drive" failed of its object. Senator Baird was elected. It would seem that New Jersey voters like a man who, as Mr. Baird expressed it, "does not change his convictions over night."

THE suffragists have carried South Dakota at last. But they did so by a trick. They persuaded the Legislature, at a special session, to attach to the pending suffrage amendment an amendment providing that aliens may not vote except after five years' residence, and after taking out final citizenship papers. After these two unrelated questions were, as the *Woman Citizen* expressed it, "securely tied together," it was impossible to vote against suffrage without also voting against the much-needed alien amendment. So, by this device of doubtful constitutionality, the suffragists carried their point.

THAT was a rather restricted exercise of the suffrage which was permitted Illinois women at the election in November. Not only could they not vote for Governor, State officers, members of the Legislature, Representatives in Congress, or United States Senators, but the Attorney General ruled that they had no voice as to the pending bond issue, or the Constitutional Amendment propositions. They were privileged to vote for three trustees of the State University, but that was all.

THE rapid progress which is being made toward nation-wide Prohibition lends special timeliness to the "Bit of History" elsewhere printed. Conscientious and enthusiastic workers for that cause will be edified to see the full text of the letter in which, in September, 1900, the National leader of the suffragists, Susan B. Anthony, openly and officially besought the support of the United States Brewers' Association.

THE SUFFRAGISTS AND PEACE

The suffragists lost no time in declaring their conclusion that it would not do to have men alone included in the membership of the Peace Conference. Places must be found for the Frau Schwimmers, the Jeannette Rankins and the Carrie Chapman Catts.

As early as the 9th of November, before the armistice had been signed, the *Woman Citizen* announced that it was not only "desirable" but "inherently necessary" that the personnel of the conference "should include women in adequate representation." The *Woman Citizen* was willing to admit that to do what it demanded would break established precedent, since no woman "had ever sat with a peace commission by the appointment of her government," but it was quite willing to smash precedents, since "this is the age and this the hour when established precedent has lost its stranglehold and custom has lost its throttling power."

Women, it appears further from the argument of the *Woman Citizen*, "seem to possess an understanding of the psychology of human nature that dowers them with a distinct power of contribution to the peace table." Think what would happen to the peace table without the presence of this understanding of the psychology of human nature.

But it would appear that this understanding of psychology is somehow limited to suffragist women, for the *Woman Citizen* goes on to say:

"It is part of the plan that women candidates who may be proposed shall be women who can be relied upon to uphold free representative institutions, based upon the will of all the people, in every land in which independent autonomy is established."

Nor is this all. Not only must suffragist women alone be regarded as eligible for membership in the peace conference; but the *Woman Citizen* dreams of forcing woman suffrage upon the world as one of the peace

conditions. It outlines the program thus:

"It will also be urged that nations which are signatories to the final peace agreements shall enter into a compact to further representative institutions in their own countries, *these institutions not to be based upon the will of a privileged few, but upon the universal will of the people, men and women alike.*"

It is a little hard to treat seriously such a program as this; but the National American Woman Suffrage Association adopted it with enthusiasm and called on the heads of all national women's organizations to urge that women be appointed to the commission. It seems never to have occurred to the suffrage leaders that it was a little presumptuous to try to force woman suffrage into the deliberations of the peace conference when their own country was three-fourths male suffrage.

THE NEBRASKA REFERENDUM

Any one who read the headline in the *Woman Citizen*, "Victory in Nebraska," would naturally suppose that there really had been a suffrage victory in that State. Instead of that, what happened was that the suffragists, by means of protracted hearings in the courts, had consumed so much time that it was impossible for the other side to present its testimony in season to admit of putting the question on the ballot.

The net result, therefore, was that the question was not submitted. But, in the meantime, the partial suffrage bill enacted by the last Legislature remains suspended and inoperative. And this is what the suffragists describe as a "victory."

Is it not perfectly plain that, if the suffragists believed that they had the majority of the voters of the State with them, they would have rejoiced at the opportunity to test the sentiment of the people, instead of doing everything in their power to block the referendum? And, if any legal complications prevented the taking of the

vote, instead of rejoicing over the delay as a "victory" would they not have deplored it as a setback to their cause? The course which they have followed is in itself a confession that the people of Nebraska are not with them.

The suffragists got their bill through the Legislature originally by a dicker with two German-American members of the Senate. The suffrage bill was two votes short in the Senate. The German-Americans were anxious to put through a bill for the teaching of German in the grade schools; and the suffragists agreed to furnish the requisite votes if the German-Americans, in turn, would vote for the suffrage bill. Accordingly, the German-American votes were "delivered," and the suffragists carried out their part of the bargain. It is not strange that the suffragists felt rather doubtful about the prospects of a referendum on a bill which was the fruit of so discreditable a dicker.

THE voters of Ohio have dealt another blow to the suffragist pretension that suffrage and prohibition go "hand in hand" and that the sinister forces, in any State, are arrayed on the anti-suffrage side. Ohio adopted a prohibition amendment at the polls last November; but, in November, 1917, it defeated woman suffrage by a majority of 146,120. Bearing on the same point is the fact that California, a suffrage State, has again defeated prohibition at the polls.

LOUISIANA suffragists had hoped to be able to admit women to the primaries, after the Arkansas plan, by a simple act of the Legislature. But they discovered that the Louisiana Constitution, in its 200th article, contains the definite provision: "No person shall vote at any primary election unless he is, at the same time, a registered voter." As women were obviously not "registered voters," they could not be let in by the back door; and, in November, the Louisiana voters, by defeating the suffrage amendment at the polls, closed the front door.

"WHEN THE BOYS COME HOME"

Miss Blackwell, in the *Woman Citizen* for Nov. 18, made the following impassioned appeal for woman suffrage:

"When our boys come home from France, will they come home to a country of clean national, state and local government, where the authorities are working in good faith to build up the welfare of the people, and to maintain the principles for which our soldiers and sailors have shed their blood—the principles of justice and right, or protection for the weak and fair play for all? Or will they come home to an environment of base politics, with the authorities in league with every sort of corruption, and our public affairs dominated by unchecked selfishness, profiteering and greed? The kind of environment to which our boys come back will have more influence upon their future lives than all the good preaching they may have heard in the course of the war. If the mothers use their votes wisely, they can determine whether that environment shall be wholesome or unwholesome, inspiring or degrading."

If THE REMONSTRANCE may be permitted, with proper diffidence, to answer Miss Blackwell's question, it will suggest that what our boys find, as they come home from France, will depend a great deal upon what city they come home to. If they come home to Chicago, they will come to a city afflicted with a Mayor who refused to show even the commonest civility to Marshal Joffre, because he was afraid of the German vote. They will find the women voters swelling the majorities of the Hinky Dinks and the Bathhouse Johns, and the Thompson régime in that city "going from bad to worse." They will find the women voters responsible for such results as are described by that ardent suffrage organ, the *New York Evening Post*, in these words:

"In two wards the women, voting alone, would have elected a different Alderman from the one chosen, and in each case they would have given the place to an unfit candidate. One of these wards was the Second, in which the men voted, 3,900 to 3,200,

for a candidate who is a member of the Legislature and was commended by the Legislative Voters' League for 'a record of growing usefulness.' The women voted 2,759 to 2,705 for a candidate whom the Municipal Voters' League condemned by declaring: '*No Alderman in Chicago's history piled up a worse record in so short a time.*'

In the Ninth Ward, the men voted 3,300 to 2,900 for the candidate endorsed by the League while the women voted 1,700 to 1,600 for the candidate of the Thompson-Lundin machine.

Or, if it is to New York that the boys come back, as many thousands of them will, they will find dominant there the alliance between socialism and suffrage, described by the Socialist organ, the *Call*, as "*inseparable companions in revolutionary thought and action.*"

Or, if it is to California that the boys come back, they will find what the *Boston Herald* of Feb. 6, 1918, strikingly described as "Sorry California," the conditions prevailing in which were indicated by the *Herald* thus:

"A Los Angeles paper, with a brutal frankness quite at variance with the usual golden tales that come eastward from that region, tells of hundreds of small property owners who are losing their holdings because they cannot meet the ever-increasing taxes; of the desperate struggle of workers; and of crippled industries. And the whole thing is traced to the 'reform' and 'progressive' legislation that California, perhaps more than any other State, had been swallowing, hook, sinker and line."

The list might be extended, if it were desirable, to include Denver, Seattle, San Francisco and other cities where women have been voting for years. But, if Miss Blackwell had it at the back of her mind to substitute for the outworn slogan "Woman Suffrage as a War Measure" a new slogan "Mothers' Votes to Make Things Pleasant for the Boys When They Come Home" she will find it wise to look the ground over somewhat carefully first.

AN INSINCERE EXCUSE

According to Dr. Shaw, Mrs. Catt and other suffrage leaders who persuaded President Wilson to favor the Federal suffrage amendment, the argument which chiefly interested and influenced him, was their presentation of the phrasing of certain state constitutions which made their amendment impossible.

President Wilson is too thorough a student of constitutions to have been so easily beguiled. It is true that the provisions for amending state constitutions vary in different states; but there is no state in which the electorate cannot secure change in the fundamental law when it is so disposed.

What the suffragists really mean, and what they would admit if they were candid, is that they want to dodge the voters. They want to secure suffrage without what they describe as the "humiliation" of appealing to the electorate. They want to coerce conservative non-suffrage states by forcing the suffrage upon them over the heads of the voters, through the action of other states.

No one will pretend that the Constitution of Massachusetts, for example, is impossible to amend. It has just passed through the process of general revision and amendment by a Constitutional Convention; and it is now open to amendment at any time through the initiative-referendum. Ida Husted Harper, Chairman of the National Suffrage Press Committee, in a letter published in May, 1917, wrote that Massachusetts "will not grant the suffrage to women until compelled to do so by a Federal Amendment."

There we have the key to the suffrage programme. The suffragists are moving heaven and earth to secure the Federal Amendment because they hope with it to "compel" States to accept electoral conditions which they have repeatedly rejected by the free vote of their citizens.

HOLDING ON TO THEIR JOBS

What will the women do who took the places in industry of the men who went to the war?

When the men who have been risking their lives "over there" to make the world safe for democracy come back, are they to find their former jobs all taken and obstinately held; or will the women who have been holding them go back to what were their normal occupations in normal times?

That is a question which is in the minds of most Americans at the present moment; and it is everywhere recognized as a question on which a great deal depends. Apparently, the suffrage leaders have no doubt about it. Within a week after the signing of the armistice, Miss Rose Young, editor-in-chief of the *Woman Citizen*, expressed her views freely to a representative of the *Washington Herald*. A New York despatch of Nov. 17 to the *Herald* says:

"The plan of the National Association of Manufacturers to open the door to every soldier and sailor who wishes to return to his old job is viewed with disapproval by Miss Rose Young, Director of the Leslie Woman Suffrage Bureau.

"They always think in terms of men," said Miss Rose today. "That announcement is a good illustration of the way employers look at the case. The question is not quite so simple as that. They have not done their full duty to society when they take care of only one sex."

"But how about the nation's gratitude to the returning soldiers?"

"Our gratitude to the soldiers is balanced by our gratitude to the women who took up their burdens at home."

"Well, how would you solve the problem? Leave the men to shift for themselves?"

"I think it should be a question merely of the survival of the fittest. The employer should decide wholly from the angle of fitness for the job."

This interview throws light on the suffrage idea of patriotism. Miss Young is herself a beneficiary of the Leslie Fund, and has no occasion for anxiety about employment. But as

she looks out upon the problem presented by the returning soldiers and their work, she can see no obligation resting upon society or upon employers because of all that they have dared and suffered. From her point of view, the women who took their jobs at high wages are as patriotic and as deserving of gratitude as the men who risked their lives on the battlefields; and the only thing for employers to consider is "the survival of the fittest." Employers who are inclined to give the men back their jobs are guilty of thinking only "in terms of men."

Happily, a great many American women took the work which the soldiers left from the most unselfish motives. The country needed them, and they answered the call. They did not desire or intend to sit tight upon their jobs, and keep the soldiers returning from the horrors of war from taking up their work again. It is not for these women that Rose Young speaks. But her dictum as to the "survival of the fittest" and deciding questions of employment solely from "the angle of fitness for the job" is as cold and heartless a declaration as has been made.

DOES TWO-THIRDS MEAN TWO-THIRDS?

The question discussed in the April REMONSTRANCE, whether the words "two-thirds of both Houses," in Article V of the Constitution of the United States, really mean two-thirds of both Houses or something else, is one which may prove to be of vital importance.

It has been assumed that, because two-thirds of the members of the House of Representatives who were present when the vote was taken on the suffrage amendment last January voted in favor of submission, that vote was decisive, so far as the House is concerned. But was it?

The *Philadelphia North American* is an ardent suffrage paper. Yet, it has said editorially:

"It should be borne in mind that adoption of a resolution to amend the fundamental law requires not merely a majority, but a constitutional majority — two-thirds of the full membership of the body. . . . It is not an easy undertaking to get a constitutional majority in favor of a proposal against which there is organized opposition, *since every vacancy and every absentee counts as an adverse vote.*"

A writer in the *New York Sun* directs attention to the requirement of Article V of the Constitution, which prescribes that, for the submission of an amendment, the vote of two-thirds of the State Legislatures or of two thirds of both Houses of Congress is necessary. The membership of the House is 435; two thirds of that number would be 290; but the vote in the House on the 10th of January, in favor of submitting the suffrage amendment, was only 274, or sixteen votes short of the required two-thirds. The writer concludes that even the adoption of the amendment by the vote of three fourths or of all of the States would not alter the fact that the amendment is unconstitutional, and it is impossible that the United States Supreme Court should decide otherwise.

The suffrage leaders are finding it convenient not to discuss this point. But their unwillingness to discuss it does not eliminate it. And, at a later stage, they may find it a fatal obstacle to the achievement of their aims.

LIGHT is thrown upon the claim that woman suffrage is a great popular movement by the disclosure of the fact — shown by the Treasurer's report of the Woman Suffrage Party of New York State — that more than 80 per cent. of the \$420,405 spent in the suffrage campaign last year was contributed by forty-seven individuals; and only \$1,254.94 came in in "dues." Except for the lavish gifts of those forty-seven individuals, the suffrage campaign would early have gone to smash.

"AS A WAR MEASURE"

Now that the war is over, we may hope that we have heard the last of the claim that suffrage for women is "a war measure."

The suffragists began using this slogan as soon as the United States went into the war. To any rational mind, nothing could be clearer than that the persistent pressing of a divisive issue in time of war would weaken the nation's strength. But the suffrage leaders were not concerned about this. What they were after was not the winning of the war. What they wanted was suffrage, at any risk or any cost. So, they declared it to be "the time of times" to carry their point, whatever happened; and they succeeded in pestering the President to such an extent that he adopted their slogan, and went gravely before the Senate, and took the unprecedented course of urging the adoption of the suffrage resolution as essential to the prosecution of the war. That was on the 1st of October; and on the 11th of November—six weeks later—the armistice was signed, disproving the President's statement, and silencing the suffrage slogan.

It ought not to be forgotten, and it is to be hoped that it will not be, that whatever service the suffrage leaders have rendered in the prosecution of the war has been given grudgingly. American womanhood, as a whole, responded nobly to the unexpected demands of the war. There was no limit to its devotion and its sacrifices. But the suffrage leaders insisted on being paid for what they did or were expected to do, and, more than that, on being paid in advance by the concession of what they were striving for. Mrs. Carrie Chapman Catt, President of the National American Woman Suffrage Association, sounded the suffragist key-note when, speaking before the Senate Committee at Washington, on the 20th of April, 1917, she said:

"Today we stand upon the verge of what may prove the greatest test

of endurance yet put upon our Republic. Women, the greatest force our nation possesses for the creation of public sentiment, are asked to mobilise their forces in aid of a government which has wronged them."

Those are words to be remembered, as an expression of the suffragist conception of patriotism.

"WHAT HAPPENED TO SUFFRAGE?"

This question the *Woman Citizen* printed conspicuously on its editorial page in its issue for Nov. 9, and quoted the *Detroit Journal* as saying that "a powerful if not sinister influence was swept into the scale against the amendment at the eleventh hour." The *Detroit Journal* thinks, or professes to think, that it was "an amazing thing" that Mr. Wilson's personal appeal to the Senate should be ignored, and it calls for "rigid searching investigation."

There is no need of searching investigation to determine what happened to suffrage. The really amazing thing was that Mr. Wilson should have thought it decorous to go before the Senate to make a personal appeal for a proposal which the Constitution of the United States puts entirely beyond his power. It would have been still more amazing if Senators who had strong convictions against the proposal should have been willing to surrender them at the demand of the President. They had intelligence of their own, and consciences of their own, and had reached conclusions of their own. Up to a short time ago, Mr. Wilson had shared those conclusions. To have given them up because Mr. Wilson had seen fit to give them up would have been indicative of moral cowardice.

The anti-suffrage Senators were not made of that kind of stuff. Threats had no effect upon them. They stood their ground, and voted in accord with their convictions. So, that is what happened to suffrage.

THE RAID ON SENATOR BORAH

Senator Borah of Idaho was a special target of the suffragists in the November elections.

Himself an avowed suffragist, Senator from a suffrage State, and at one time sponsor for a suffrage amendment, he had ventured to declare that he would not vote for a measure that deprived each State of the right to control its own elective franchise. He could not be driven or threatened or bullied from this position. He announced to the Senate last May that "no amount of telegrams which can be poured in here will have any effect upon the Senator from Idaho. Upon this subject he has views which are not subject to change."

So, both of the national suffrage organizations made war upon him. The *Woman Citizen* published pages of broadsides against him. The National Woman's Party organized a campaign against him by districts and precincts because he had "dared to belittle the wishes of his constituents." For weeks they went up and down the State, soliciting votes against him. And what happened? He was triumphantly re-elected for another six-year term in the Senate by the voters of Idaho, men and women.

And, after all this, the National Woman's Party has the effrontery to "demand" that he vote for the suffrage amendment. No one could be in a better position than he to disregard the suffrage "demands." The issue involved has been taken to the people of his State—a State in which women have been voting for more than twenty years—and they have approved his action.

DOES *The Woman Citizen* think it altogether wise to exult, as it did in a recent issue, over the fact that "Russia heads the list with approximately 26,000,000 enfranchised women"? To a sane mind, there is nothing very alluring in the Russian example of a great country plunged in bloodshed and anarchy.

A BIT OF HISTORY

IN view of the constant reiteration by the suffragists of the false charge of a sinister alliance between anti-suffragists and the liquor interests, it seems timely to recall the fact that, so long ago as 1900, the suffragists, officially, through the head of their national organization, entreated the support of the United States Brewers' Association.

The Brewers' Association met in convention at Atlantic City, June 5-7, in that year. On the 23d of May, Susan B. Anthony addressed the following letter to the President, Officers and Members of the Association:

Gentlemen: As chairman of the committee appointed by our National Suffrage Association to address letters to all of the large conventions held this year, allow me to bring before you the great need of the recognition of the women of our country in all of the rights, privileges and immunities of United States citizenship.

Though your association has for its principal object the management of the great brewing interests of this country, yet I have noted that from year to year you have adopted resolutions declaring against woman suffrage. I therefore appeal to you, since the question seems to come within the scope of your deliberations, that you will reverse this action, this closing year of the century, and declare yourselves in favor of the practical application of the fundamental principles of our government to all the people—women as well as men. Whatever your nationality, whatever your religious creed, whatever your political party, you are either a born or naturalized citizen of the United States, and because of that are a voter of the State in which you reside. Will you not, gentlemen, accord to the women of this country, having the same citizenship as yourselves, precisely the same privileges and powers which you possess because of that one fact? The only true principle—the only safe policy—of a democratic-republican government is that every class of people shall be protected in the exercise of the right of individual representation. I pray you, therefore, to pass a resolution in favor of woman suffrage, and order your officers, in behalf of the association, to sign a petition to Congress for this purpose, and thereby

put the weight of your influence on the side of making this government a genuine republic.

Enclosed is a form of petition to Congress for a Sixteenth Amendment to the Federal Constitution, which shall prohibit the disfranchisement of United States citizens on account of sex. Please make two copies of it on your own official paper, if adopted, and return both to me after they are signed. Kindly send me also a copy of the woman's suffrage resolution if one is passed. In any case, I shall esteem it a favor to be informed of whatever action may be taken upon these requests.

Should you desire to have one of our best woman suffrage speakers to address your convention, if you will let me know as soon as possible, I will take pleasure in arranging for one to do so. Hoping to hear from you favorably, I remain,

Very sincerely yours,
Susan B. Anthony.

Miss Anthony was disappointed. She did not hear favorably. The convention instructed its Secretary "to inform Miss Anthony that this is a body of business men; that we meet for business purposes and not for politics; furthermore, that she is mistaken and misinformed regarding her statement that we have passed resolutions opposing woman's suffrage. We have never taken such action at any of our conventions or on any other occasion."

So the incident passed. The suffrage leaders of today very likely would be well pleased to have it forgotten. But it is a matter of official record. The Margaret Foleys of today who, during state campaigns, address Brewers' Unions, or tell crowds at street corners that "suffrage will not take away their beer," may well feel sustained by the action of their national association nineteen years ago.

But suppose that the National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage, or any State Association, were convicted of having officially asked the endorsement and assistance of the United States Brewers' Association, into what frenzies of vituperation and calumny would not the suffragists have been thrown? The mere fact that, in one Ohio town, the paid distributor

of campaign literature stupidly left liquor circulars and anti-suffrage circulars at the same doorways on his rounds furnished them with material for reams of slanderous accusations of an identity of interests between the two causes; and led them to accuse some of the best and noblest women in this country of being the allies of the saloons and the white slavers, or, as Dr. Anna Howard Shaw expressed it at the hearing before the Senate Committee at Washington, April 26, 1913, of "holding out their skirts to make a screen for the men operating dens of vice and iniquity and prostitution to hide behind."

Anti-suffragists will not retaliate with like charges. But the Susan B. Anthony letter tells its own story.

THE REAL SUFFRAGE ISSUE

(From the New York Journal of Commerce, Oct. 9, 1918)

The real issue at bottom is not one of democracy or republicanism in government, so far as this nation is concerned, but of the preserving or discarding of the fundamental principle of our union of States, the right of each to maintain control in its own affairs and in its influence upon national affairs, and not the right of some States to exercise compulsion upon others against the will of their own people. This latter is neither democracy nor republicanism, but a violation of both.

WOMEN'S ANTI-SUFFRAGE ASSOCIATION OF MASSACHUSETTS

687 BOYLSTON STREET, BOSTON

At the Meeting of the Executive Committee, November 1st, 1918, it was voted to recommend strongly to the thousands of Anti-Suffragists throughout the State that they confine their War Work activities in future to such organizations as are neutral and non-partisan, instead of supporting those which allow themselves to be used as an advertising medium for political purposes.

Mrs. THOMAS ALLEN,
President.

THE VOTE IN OKLAHOMA

The Governor of Oklahoma has made formal proclamation of the adoption of the suffrage amendment at the election in November. But there are suspicious, not to say sinister circumstances connected with the counting of the vote which abundantly justify searching judicial inquiry.

The Oklahoma Constitution is peculiar in this—that it is not enough that a proposed amendment, in order to become a part of the Constitution, shall receive a majority of the votes cast upon it, but it must receive a majority vote of all the electors voting at the election upon any issue.

At the November election, it was the total vote for Governor which furnished the test of the votes required for the adoption of the suffrage amendment. Evidently, therefore, if the total Gubernatorial vote could be kept down, in the making of the returns, the number of votes required for the adoption of the proposed amendment would be reduced proportionately. If the actual vote cast for Governor was, for example, 300,000, and, through an adroit suppression of some returns, it could be made to appear to be 250,000, the adoption of the amendment would require only 125,001 votes, instead of 150,001.

Here are some of the suspicious circumstances connected with the count in Oklahoma.

First, the total Gubernatorial vote, as reported, was nearly 100,000 less than that cast for President two years earlier. To be exact, the Presidential vote of 1916 was 95,922 larger than that recorded for Governor in 1918. Or, if it seems more fair to compare only Gubernatorial votes, how did it happen that 55,780 more Oklahoman voters went to the polls in 1914 than in 1918?

Second, there were thirty-four Oklahoma counties which made no returns to the State Election Board of the total number of electors voting.

Third, there were forty-eight counties which made no return whatever of the soldier vote.

Fourth, there were twenty-eight counties where the returns of the soldier vote were obviously incomplete, running as low as 2 or 3 in some, and totaling for the 28 counties only 455.

Fifth, returns from some of the counties—Tulsa county in particular—were held back nearly three weeks, precisely as they might have been if it had been intended to retard the count until it could be ascertained what results were wanted.

Altogether, the demand of the Oklahoma Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage for a revision and completion of the returns was just and reasonable.

A SUFFRAGIST PEACE CONFERENCE

Public attention is so concentrated upon the Peace Conference in France that little notice has been taken of the suffragist peace conference at the Hague.

Back of this conference is the International Committee of Women on Permanent Peace, of which Jane Addams is President. This is the Committee which held the Peace Congress, which was financed by Mr. Ford, in the spring of 1915, in which Frau Schwimmer was the leading figure, and which clamored for peace at any price. If it had had its way at that time, Germany would now be mistress of the world, instead of the beaten and broken thing that she is. Frau Schwimmer is expected to figure in the second congress; also the German women who were lately appealing to Miss Addams to secure a softening of the terms of the armistice. It was at first planned that the new congress should meet at Paris; but it is explained that "there were certain obviously impractical features to this plan." One of these features, it is conjectured, was the doubtful expediency of having German and Austrian women, with American pacifists as colleagues, crying out tearfully for lenient peace terms in the country which for four and a quarter years had suffered every form of German savagery. Of the attitude of these

pacifist ladies the *New York Times* of Nov. 30 truthfully said:

"They hold the socialist theory, it seems, of a world divided into hostile classes. Women are a class, a group, something apart, with class interests which require a congress of their own for definition; a class which apparently hates and distrusts men, regarding them as another class which can be met only in momentary attraction by way of interlude in fundamental and eternal hostility. The millions of women who have worked and suffered to help win the war for democracy will hardly relish the revival of sex-antagonism by women who insisted that the war was wholly wrong."

THE suffragist success in Michigan last November teaches the familiar lesson,—that, when suffrage wins at the polls at all, it is almost invariably by a light vote. Six years before, the suffragists polled 247,375 votes—and were beaten. Last November, they polled only 222,488 votes, yet they carried the State by a majority of 34,052. Anti-suffragists in any other States where the issue is presented, who are tempted to think that it will take care of itself, and that there is no need of special exertion to defeat it, should take the lesson to heart.

ACCORDING to the Australasian Bureau of the *Christian Science Monitor*, Dec. 4, although women have had the local parliamentary vote in Australia for from 10 to 23 years, and the national suffrage for 16 years, "they have not accomplished as much in regard to certain measures of reform as women in other lands, in the United States in particular, have accomplished without the vote." That is rather a striking admission for a journal which is an ardent champion of woman suffrage.

We, the undersigned, in behalf of the Association, desire to thank each and every one who contributed to the "Dollar Drive" and helped to make it a success.

Committee { MARY B. FORBES
MRS. JOHN BALCH
MARY K. V. WHITE